

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application and were examined in the most recent action. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

As can be seen from the above amendments, the specification is merely amended to correct various minor errors while the claims are amended in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. None of the amendments add new matter.

Objection to the Specification

The action objected to the specification, and in particular to the abstract not appearing on a separate page. In view of the foregoing amendments to the specification, the obvious PCT format of the specification and the requirement to place the abstract on a separate page, the applicant herewith provides a substitute specification. Apart from the noted foregoing amendments and placing the abstract on a separate page, no other changes are made in the substitute specification. No new matter is added.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

As can be seen from the above amendments, claims 1-3, 6, 8-10, 13, 15-16, 18 and 19 are merely amended in order to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention without adding any new matter. More particularly, the claims are amended to limit the usage of the acronym “HAS” therein to refer only to the home automation service. Other instances of the use of the acronym particularly in connection with additional recited structure are amended to fully spell out home automation service, for clarity sake. Additionally, full text is provided for other instances of acronyms used in the claims. The claims are otherwise additionally amended to add clarity, without otherwise altering the scope of the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 8, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bossemeyer (US 2002/0037004). The applicant traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Bossemeyer does not disclose, teach or suggest “a home automation service channel means included in an ADSL terminal for transmitting/receiving a home automation service control signal and data with home automation devices in wired or wireless communication mode using ADSL low rate signals.”

The examiner asserts that “telephone functions connected to a variety of communication carriers” corresponds to the claimed home automation service channel means. However, the home automation system in accordance with the present invention transfers the home automation service control signal and data through a home automation channel not a voice channel (telephone function) in ADSL. The home automation channel is established based on the ADSL low rate signals. That is, Bossemeyer fails to teach the home automation service channel means for transferring the home automation service control signal and data based on the ADSL low rate signals.

Because Bossemeyer fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation set forth in the claims, it cannot anticipate or render the claims unpatentable. Hence, claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 2-5, 9-12 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Bossemeyer (US 2002/0037004) and Eames (US 6,208,637). The applicant traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

As discussed above, because Bossemeyer does not disclose, teach or suggest “a home automation service channel means included in an ADSL terminal for transmitting/receiving a home automation service control signal and data with home automation devices in wired or wireless communication mode using ADSL low rate signal,”

independent claims 1, 8, 15 are allowable over Bossemeyer. Therefore, claims 2-5, 9-12 and 16-17 are also allowable for at least the same reasons and on their own merits.

Moreover, the examiner alleges that the Eames “ATM framer” corresponds to a HAS framer and the “DMT processor” corresponds to a HAS agent. Referring to Fig. 17 and Col. 17, lines 25-43 of Eames, there is no description of the function of the ATM framer, and the described DMT processor 1700 supports both receive and transmit functions including coding and decoding, equalization, mapping of DMT carriers, ADSL framing and deframing, and ATM cell specific deframing.

Furthermore, the DMT processor of Eames does not perform the functions of the HAS framer. That is, the Eames DMT processor does not generate data having a HAS message format based on message types and information parameters or transfer the data to the low rate processing unit or extract a message type and information parameter from data having HAS message format received from the low rate processing unit. Nor does Eames describe a HAS agent that receives messages and information parameters from the HAS framer, performs a home service process and transfers the home automation service control signal and data to the wireless HAS circuit and the wired HAS circuit.

Accordingly, the combination of Bossemeyer in view of Eames does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims. Therefore, claims 2-5, 9-12, 16 and 17 are allowable over the combination of Bossemeyer in view of Eames.

Claims 6-7, 13-14, 18 and 19 were objected to but indicated to be allowable if the 112, second paragraph objections were overcome and if the claims were rewritten in independent form. In view of the foregoing, the objections are overcome. Also, because claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable, these claims are now allowable.

The applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance, and such action is requested at the examiner's earliest convenience.

Dated: November 18, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony G Sitko, 36278/

Anthony G. Sitko

Registration No.: 36,278

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300

Sears Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant